

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/985,676	Applicant(s) PATEL ET AL.	
	Examiner Shawki S. Ismail	Art Unit 2155	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Shawki S. Ismail. (3) _____

(2) Garth Richmond (reg. No. 43,044). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 29 January 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: All pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed possible amendments that will place the application into condition for allowance. Claim 9 was used as a representative claims and therefore it was suggested by the examiner that incorporation of claim 12 into independent claim 9 would make the claim allowable of the prior art. The examiner also suggested making the other independent claims parallel to claim 9 as well as amending them to overcome possible 112 rejections and in order to make the entire application into condition for allowance. Mr. Richmond agreed to the proposed changes and the examiner agreed to make the changes in the form of an examiner's amendment and pass the case to issue.